

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action mailed June 29, 2004, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration. To further the prosecution of this application, Applicants have amended claims and added claims, and hereby present the following remarks.

Initially, Applicants wish to thank Examiner Justin King for the courtesy he extended in granting and conducting a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney on August 13, 2004. During that interview, it was agreed that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, would be withdrawn, and that the amendments to claim 25 presented herein distinguish patentably over the applied art.

The Specification

Applicants have amended the title to be more descriptive, thus obviating the stated objection to the specification.

Claims 25 – 30 and 40

As noted above, during the August 13, 2004 telephone interview, it was agreed that, in view of the claim amendments presented herein, all pending rejections of claim 25 would be withdrawn. Accordingly, claim 25 should now be in allowable condition.

Each of claims 26-30, and 40, being dependent on claim 25, distinguishes patentably over the applied art for at least the same reasons.

New Claims 41-52

New claim 41 is directed to a method for controlling access to a bus by at least first and second bus masters. According to the method, access to the bus by the first and second bus masters is controlled so that, during periods when all requests for access to the bus are of the same priority level, the first and second bus masters are guaranteed to have access to first and second respective portions of the available bandwidth of the bus, with the first portion being greater than the second portion.

The prior art of record does not teach or suggest controlling access to a bus such that, when all requests for access to the bus are of the same priority level, first and second bus masters are guaranteed access to different portions of the available bandwidth of the bus.

Claim 41 therefore distinguishes patentably over the art of record. Each of claims 42-52, being dependent on claim 41, distinguishes patentably over the art of record for at least the same reasons.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application should now be in condition for allowance. A notice to this effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicants hereby request any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee, that is not covered by an enclosed check, please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 23/2825.

Respectfully submitted,
Hadwiger et al., Applicant(s)

By: 

Robert M. Abrahamsen, Reg. No. 40,886
Wolf, Greenfield & Sacks, P.C.
600 Atlantic Avenue
Boston, Massachusetts 02210-2211
Telephone: (617) 646-8000

Docket No. A0312.70496US00
Date: August 23, 2004
x09/29/04x